



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,561	561 11/21/2003		Deane A. Horne	20811.003US	3563
22870	7590	03/06/2006		EXAMINER	
LAURENC			WARTALOWICZ, PAUL A		
1201 WEST	PEACHT	REE STREET, NW			
14TH FLOO	R		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ATLANTA, GA 30309-3488				1754	

DATE MAILED: 03/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/719,561	HORNE ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Paul A. Wartalowicz	1754
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 Not</u> This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	vn from consideration. r election requirement.	
10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 21 November 2003 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the constant drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the constant of the con	re: a) \square accepted or b) \square object drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is object.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/21/03.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 8-11, 14-20, 23, 26-31, and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Myerson et al. (U.S. 5759503).

Myerson et al. teach a process for recovering zinc oxide from a waste material (col. 1, lines 30-35; col. 9, lines 29-37) wherein the waste materials contacted with a reducing gas (col. 10, lines 17-20) wherein the zinc oxide is further purified comprising heating the zinc oxide to a temperature above 271°C (col. 14, lines 36-37) wherein to ensure that the material is free of chloride (col. 14, lines 33-35) wherein the residence time is from 2 to 60 minutes (col. 14, lines 41-44). As to the limitation in claims 28 and 34 wherein the heating of the zinc oxide containing material increases the purity of the zinc oxide without substantially degrading the surface area of the material, Myerson et al. teach wherein the purification process can be controlled to produce zinc oxide having a desired surface area (col. 6, lines 60-62) and wherein the final zinc oxide product is 99.8% pure (col. 7, lines 19-21). As to the limitations wherein the process improves the purity of the zinc containing material from under 60% to over 60% by mass, and wherein the process improves the purity of zinc oxide from under 98% to over 98% by mass, Myerson et al. teach a process wherein the process meets the limitations of the

Art Unit: 1754

applicants invention such that afore mentioned limitations of purity improvements are inherently taught by Myerson et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 5-7, 12-13, 21-22, 24-25, 32-33, and 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Myerson et al. (U.S. 5759503) in view of Kindrick (U.S. 4331706).

Myerson et al. teach a process for purifying zinc oxide as described in claims 1, 16, 28, and 34. Myerson et al. fail to teach wherein the time period is greater than 1 hour and wherein the time period is greater than 2 hours and wherein resulting in a zinc oxide product has a surface area of between 3 m²/g and 7 m²/g and wherein the zinc oxide product has a surface area of between 4 m²/g and 6 m²/g.

Art Unit: 1754

Kindrick, however, teaches a process for the production of zinc oxide pigments (col. 1, lines 13-15) wherein calcination residence times can be varied for the purpose of optimizing the surface area of zinc oxide (col. 5, lines 49-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to optimize the calcination residence times, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value or a result effective variable involved only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2nd 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). The artisan would have been motivated to vary the calcination residence times by the reasoned explanation that varying the calcination residence time will result in an optimum surface area as desired.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul A. Wartalowicz whose telephone number is (571) 272-5957. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6 M-Th and 8:30-5 on Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on (571) 272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/719,561

Art Unit: 1754

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Paul Wartalowicz February 23, 2006 COLLEEN P. COOKE PRIMARY EXAMINER Page 5